

10/009398
Translation

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

#8 6-16-02
Translation

PCT

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION REPORT

(PCT Article 36 and Rule 70)

Applicant's or agent's file reference 015214.FT133	FOR FURTHER ACTION See Notification of Transmittal of International Preliminary Examination Report (Form PCT/IPEA/416)	
International application No. PCT/FR00/01071	International filing date (day/month/year) 21 April 2000 (21.04.00)	Priority date (day/month/year) 23 April 1999 (23.04.99)
International Patent Classification (IPC) or national classification and IPC H04M 11/06		RECEIVED MAY 06 2002
Applicant FRANCE TELECOM Technology Center 2600		

1. This international preliminary examination report has been prepared by this International Preliminary Examining Authority and is transmitted to the applicant according to Article 36.	
2. This REPORT consists of a total of <u>7</u> sheets, including this cover sheet.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> This report is also accompanied by ANNEXES, i.e., sheets of the description, claims and/or drawings which have been amended and are the basis for this report and/or sheets containing rectifications made before this Authority (see Rule 70.16 and Section 607 of the Administrative Instructions under the PCT).	
These annexes consist of a total of <u>3</u> sheets.	
3. This report contains indications relating to the following items:	
I <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Basis of the report
II <input type="checkbox"/>	Priority
III <input type="checkbox"/>	Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
IV <input type="checkbox"/>	Lack of unity of invention
V <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
VI <input type="checkbox"/>	Certain documents cited
VII <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Certain defects in the international application
VIII <input type="checkbox"/>	Certain observations on the international application

Date of submission of the demand 10 November 2000 (10.11.00)	Date of completion of this report 26 July 2001 (26.07.2001)
Name and mailing address of the IPEA/EP	Authorized officer
Facsimile No.	Telephone No.

I. Basis of the report

1. With regard to the elements of the international application:*

- ☐ the international application as originally filed
- ☒ the description:
pages _____ 1-29 _____, as originally filed
pages _____, filed with the demand
pages _____, filed with the letter of _____
- ☒ the claims:
pages _____, as originally filed
pages _____, as amended (together with any statement under Article 19
pages _____, filed with the demand
pages _____ 1-14 _____, filed with the letter of _____ 15 June 2001 (15.06.2001)
- ☒ the drawings:
pages _____ 1/11-11/11 _____, as originally filed
pages _____, filed with the demand
pages _____, filed with the letter of _____
- ☐ the sequence listing part of the description:
pages _____, as originally filed
pages _____, filed with the demand
pages _____, filed with the letter of _____

2. With regard to the language, all the elements marked above were available or furnished to this Authority in the language in which the international application was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.

These elements were available or furnished to this Authority in the following language _____ which is:

- ☐ the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rule 23.1(b)).
- ☐ the language of publication of the international application (under Rule 48.3(b)).
- ☐ the language of the translation furnished for the purposes of international preliminary examination (under Rule 55.2 and/or 55.3).

3. With regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application, the international preliminary examination was carried out on the basis of the sequence listing:

- ☐ contained in the international application in written form.
- ☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
- ☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority in written form.
- ☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority in computer readable form.
- ☐ The statement that the subsequently furnished written sequence listing does not go beyond the disclosure in the international application as filed has been furnished.
- ☐ The statement that the information recorded in computer readable form is identical to the written sequence listing has been furnished.

4. ☐ The amendments have resulted in the cancellation of:

- ☐ the description, pages _____
- ☐ the claims, Nos. _____
- ☐ the drawings, sheets/fig _____

5. ☐ This report has been established as if (some of) the amendments had not been made, since they have been considered to go beyond the disclosure as filed, as indicated in the Supplemental Box (Rule 70.2(c)).**

* Replacement sheets which have been furnished to the receiving Office in response to an invitation under Article 14 are referred to in this report as "originally filed" and are not annexed to this report since they do not contain amendments (Rule 70.16 and 70.17).

** Any replacement sheet containing such amendments must be referred to under item 1 and annexed to this report.

V. Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement**1. Statement**

Novelty (N)	Claims	1-14	YES
	Claims		NO
Inventive step (IS)	Claims		YES
	Claims	1-14	NO
Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims	1-14	YES
	Claims		NO

2. Citations and explanations

The following documents are mentioned in the present international preliminary report:

D1: US-A-5 848 150

D2: US-A-3 860 757.

1. The subject matter of Claim 1 does not involve an inventive step in light of the disclosure of document D1, combined with that of document D2.

In accordance with all the essential features of the present Claim 1, document D1, which is the closest prior art, discloses a filtering device for a narrowband terminal (see abstract and Figures 1 and 2 and column 2, lines 18 to 31) in a private installation connected to an access network carrying narrowband and broadband services (see abstract; column 2, lines 18 to 31; Figure 1). Moreover, the device includes low pass filtering means (see Figure 1, reference 12; Figure 2, reference 10; column 4, lines 30 to 35) and isolation means (see Figure 1, reference 14; column 4, lines 36 to 50) including parallel opposing diodes (Figure 1; column 4, lines 51 to 61), which means enable the device to have

high input impedance that isolates said device from the installation when the narrowband terminal is on-hook (see column 4, lines 40 to 45 and column 4, line 64 to column 5, line 37) while allowing the ringing signal to pass through (implicit feature in the system of document D1, since the narrowband terminals are able to go from being on-hook to being off-hook, not only for making calls, but also for receiving calls).

The device specified by Claim 1 is therefore different from that shown in D1 in that the diodes used are Zener diodes positioned in a series.

However, this feature is known from document D2 (Figure 4, reference signs 29, 49, 33 and 53; column 6, lines 25 to 26), which discloses the same technical problem and the same solution as the present Claim 1 in a slightly different context.

Regardless of the value of the broadband signal frequency of Claim 1 and the value of the broader band carrier signals of the system disclosed in D2, the technical problem of the two systems is the same in both cases and relates to the necessity of being able to activate one or more filters without modifying the resulting impedance at the input of the installation. The solution proposed in D2, which involves isolating the filtering means using parallel opposing Zener diodes placed in a series, is therefore also suitable for the present application, since the nature and frequency of the signals to be separated do not, as mentioned above, play any role in solving the problem of the invention.

Therefore, a person skilled in the art, starting with the device defined in document D1 and having knowledge of the content of document D2, would not have any particular difficulty applying the feature described in document D2 in order to improve the isolation features of the filtering device of document D1 and thus arrive at the device corresponding to the subject matter of Claim 1.

Consequently, the subject matter of Claim 1 does not involve an inventive step and does not meet the requirements of PCT Article 33(3).

2. The additional features of dependent Claims 2 to 11 relate to minor details for implementing the device of Claim 1, which are anticipated by document D1 (Claims 2, 3 and 5, see column 6, lines 22 to 34 and Figures 2 and 4) or are obvious to a person skilled in the art (4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11).

Therefore, these features do not add inventiveness to the device defined in Claim 1, and consequently, Claims 2 to 11 do not meet the requirements of PCT Article 33(3).

3. The subject matter of independent Claim 12 relates to a private installation characterized in that it includes a device such as that defined in one of Claims 1 to 11.

Since none of Claims 1 to 11 meets the inventive step requirements of PCT Article 33(3), Claim 12 does not meet the requirements thereof either, for the same reasons mentioned for Claims 1 to 11.

4. The additional features of dependent Claims 13 and 14 merely relate to minor details for implementing the private installation defined in Claim 12. These features are standard steps for a person skilled in the art, and consequently, Claims 13 and 14 do not meet the requirements of PCT Article 33(3).

VII. Certain defects in the international application

The following defects in the form or contents of the international application have been noted:

1. The text relating to Figure 12 describing a second embodiment of the invention is inconsistent with the content of Figure 12, which shows the relay as being part of the filtering means, whereas the description (page 20, lines 9 to 13) specifies that the relay is part of the isolator.
2. On page 5, line 32 of the description, the French phrase "il ne doit pas **doit pas** altérer" should be corrected.
3. On page 13, line 20 of the description, the phrase "a plurality of filtering device" should be changed as follows: "a plurality of filtering devices".
4. On page 18, line 11 of the description, the phrase "dans ce cas" should be changed to "**Dans** ce cas".
5. Document D1, which is considered the closest prior art, has not been mentioned in the introductory part of the description (PCT Rule 5.1(a)(ii)).